

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

As required, the Abstract has been corrected to delete the word “comprises”.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as allegedly being “anticipated” by the admitted prior art (pages 1-2 of the specification and Figures 4A-4C). While not acquiescing in this rejection, claims 1-4 have been amended. As such, the discussion below makes reference to the amended claims.

Claim 1 is directed to a mobile apparatus incorporating a camera in which a hand strap fitting part is formed in a position that comes below a camera lens so that a hand strap connected to the hand strap fitting part does not move into a field of view of the camera lens when the mobile apparatus is held for photographing in an upright position in which a longer side of the mobile apparatus is held upright with a top portion thereof being directed upward. As is apparent from inspection of Figures 4A-4C, the admitted prior art does not disclose a hand strap fitting part arranged as specified in claim 1. Specifically, in Figures 4A-4C, a hand strap fitting part is formed in a position that is above a camera lens, so that a hand strap connected to the hand strap fitting part can move into the field of view of the camera lens when the mobile apparatus is held in an upright position in which a longer side of the mobile apparatus is held upright with a top portion thereof being directed upward.

Consequently, the admitted prior art does not anticipate claim 1 or its dependent claims 2 and 3.

Claim 4 is directed to a mobile apparatus incorporating a camera which includes hand strap holding part for holding a free-end portion of a hand strap of which a tied-end portion is fixed to the hand strap fitting part so that the hand strap is kept outside a field of view of the camera lens and prevented from swinging. By inspection of Figures 4A-4C, the admitted prior art does not include any mechanism for holding a free-end portion of a hand strap as specified in claim 4.

Consequently, claim 4 is not anticipated by the admitted prior art.

Claims 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being “obvious” over the admitted prior art in view of Iida (JP 9-298370). While not acquiescing in this rejection, claims 5-9 have been amended. As such, the discussion below makes reference to the amended claims.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 4 and Iida does not remedy the deficiencies of the admitted prior art with respect to these dependent claims.

For example, claim 5 specifies that hand strap holding means is a pinch holding in which the free-end portion of the hand strap is pinched in a gap and thereby held. Figures 3 and 4 of Iida clearly show that the free-end portion of strap 2 includes a hook member 23 that attaches to a fixed bar 16. There is no disclosure of a pinch holding in which a free-end portion of the hand strap is pinched in a gap as claimed.

Claim 6 specifies that the hand strap holding means comprises a hook-shaped protrusion formed integrally with a housing of the mobile apparatus. No such protrusion is disclosed by Iida. The office action makes reference to section [0012] and Figures 2-4 of Iida. However, these portions of Iida show and describe hook portion member 23 of the strap 2, not a hook-shaped protrusion integrally formed with the housing of the mobile apparatus.

Moreover, the mobile apparatus of Iida is not disclosed as including a camera and a camera lens. Thus, Iida is not concerned with problems associated with a camera lens and a hand-strap fitting part being formed on the same surface. As such, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the admitted prior art based on Iida as proposed in the office action.

For all of these reasons, the proposed combination of the admitted prior art and Iida would not have made the subject matter of claims 5 and 6 obvious.

Claim 7 is directed to a mobile apparatus incorporating a camera in which a tied-end portion of a hand strap is fixed to a hand strap fitting part and held thereby and in which a first holding portion holds a portion of the hand strap in proximity to the tied-end portion thereof and a second holding portion holds a free-end portion of the hand strap so that the hand strap is kept outside a field of view of the camera lens and prevented from swinging. The admitted prior art at least fails to disclose the claimed first and second holding portions and Iida fails to remedy this deficiency.

Iida discloses a hand strap for a mobile apparatus in which a tie-end portion of the hand strap is fixed to a fixed bar 15 via a small-diameter ring part 22 whereby a user can hold the mobile apparatus by placing the large loop portion 21 around his or her wrist. In addition, using the hook member 23, the free-end portion of the strap 2 can be secured to fixed bar 16. In this arrangement, the user can hold the mobile phone by placing the large loop portion 21 on the back of the user's hand as shown in Figure 4 of Iida. Nowhere in Iida is there any disclosure or

suggestion of the combination of a hand strap fixing part to which a tied-end of the strap is fixed and first and second holding portions, the first holding portion holding a portion of the strap in proximity to the tied end and the second holding portion holding a free end of the strap.

Consequently, the proposed combination of the admitted prior art and Iida (even assuming motivation could be identified for the combination) would not have rendered the mobile apparatus of claim 7, or of dependent claims 8 and 9, obvious.

Claims 8 and 9 are also believed to be allowable because of the additional patentable features recited therein.

For example, claim 8 calls for the first and second holding portions to be arranged on a surface lateral to the surface on which the camera lens is located. The admitted prior art discloses no holding portions and, in addition to the deficiencies noted above in connection with claim 7, Iida discloses no camera. As such, neither the admitted prior art nor Iida (nor the combination thereof) would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art how to position holding portions relative to a camera lens, much less in the manner specified in claim 8.

Claim 9 calls for the first and second holding portions to comprise hook-shaped protrusions formed integrally with a housing of the mobile apparatus. Neither the admitted prior art nor Iida discloses hook-shaped protrusions as claimed. As discussed above, the hook member 23 of Iida is secured around fixed bar 16, which is arranged in the recess of the housing of the mobile apparatus. In contrast to the cost-saving hook-shaped protrusions formed integrally with the housing, the structure of Iida causes component cost to increase. Further, the arrangement of hook-shaped protrusions allows the hand strap to be fixed temporarily so as not to move into the field of view of the camera lens, but to be used at other times as originally intended. To serve this function, the hook-shaped protrusions permit the strap to be temporarily and easily pinched and held and easily released when necessary.


For these additional and independent reasons, claims 8 and 9 are believed to be allowable.

ARAKANE, T. et al.
Application No. 10/085,618
Response to Supplemental Office Action dated September 20, 2005

The pending claims are believed to be allowable and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
Michael J. Shea
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100